



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/878,978	06/19/1997	STEPHEN F. LINDER	D/97063	8923
7590 RONALD ZIBELLI XEROX CORPORATION XEROX SQUARE 20A ROCHESTER, NY 14644				
EXAMINER				
POON, KING Y				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2625				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/20/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of Allowability**Application No.**

08/878,978

Applicant(s)

LINDER ET AL.

Examiner

KING Y. POON

Art Unit

2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

All claims being allowable, PROSECUTION ON THE MERIT IS (OR REMAINS) CLOSED in this application. If not included herewith (or previously mailed), a Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85) or other appropriate communication will be mailed in due course. **THIS NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT RIGHTS.** This application is subject to withdrawal from issue at the initiative of the Office or upon petition by the applicant. See 37 CFR 1.313 and MPEP 1308.

1. ☒ This communication is responsive to *BPAT decision on 11/30/2006*.
2. ☒ The allowed claim(s) is/are *1-5, 8, 9; renumbered as claims 1-7*.
3. ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of the:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* Certified copies not received: ____.

Applicant has THREE MONTHS FROM THE "MAILING DATE" of this communication to file a reply complying with the requirements noted below. Failure to timely comply will result in ABANDONMENT of this application.

THIS THREE-MONTH PERIOD IS NOT EXTENDABLE.

4. ☐ A SUBSTITUTE OATH OR DECLARATION must be submitted. Note the attached EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT or NOTICE OF INFORMAL PATENT APPLICATION (PTO-152) which gives reason(s) why the oath or declaration is deficient.
5. ☐ CORRECTED DRAWINGS (as "replacement sheets") must be submitted.
- (a) ☐ including changes required by the Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) attached
- 1) ☐ hereto or 2) ☐ to Paper No./Mail Date ____.
- (b) ☐ including changes required by the attached Examiner's Amendment / Comment or in the Office action of Paper No./Mail Date ____.
- Identifying indicia such as the application number (see 37 CFR 1.84(c)) should be written on the drawings in the front (not the back) of each sheet. Replacement sheet(s) should be labeled as such in the header according to 37 CFR 1.121(d).
6. ☐ DEPOSIT OF and/or INFORMATION about the deposit of BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL must be submitted. Note the attached Examiner's comment regarding REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEPOSIT OF BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL.

Attachment(s)

1. ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2. ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3. ☐ Information Disclosure Statements (PTO/SB/08), Paper No./Mail Date ____
4. ☐ Examiner's Comment Regarding Requirement for Deposit of Biological Material
5. ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6. ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413), Paper No./Mail Date ____
7. ☒ Examiner's Amendment/Comment
8. ☐ Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance
9. ☐ Other ____.

/King Y. Poon/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625

1. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

Examiner agrees with applicant's remark filed on 4/9/2001, page 5 that Matsuwana does not teach an objected-oriented image rendering system because all neutral image data is processed the same manner, regardless of the type object that a particular segment of data may pertain.

Examiner also agrees with applicant's comment in the appeal brief (page 3) filed on 3/28/2002 that: "Applicants' invention, as presently claimed, is directed to a system for processing object-oriented image data in which a composite image has first been broken into its constituent image objects. See for example, Fig. 8 and the description of an object oriented rendering system in the specification at page 16, lines 4-14. However, Applicant's invention differs from a conventional object oriented rendering system in that it includes a first parser circuit (100 on Fig. 4) which parses "the object-oriented image data into non-neutral object-oriented image data and neutral object-oriented image data". See Figs. 3 and 4 of the application and the description in the specification at page 17, lines 3-17. Note that image data is processed in the form of image triplets. An image triplet includes color image data, color space data and object type data.

Examiner further agrees that images in each of Ueda's categories or "objects" may include neutral image data and non neutral image data. For example, an image or image portion classified as a photograph -landscape may include both neutral image data and non-neutral image data. However, processing an image categorized as a photograph - landscape differently from processing an image categorized as text - bitmap font is not the same thing as "parsing the object-oriented image data into non-

neutral object-oriented image data and neutral object-oriented image data" before it is processed. In other words, Ueda does not appear to teach parsing any of the categories of images (Figs. 11-15) or "objects" into neutral object oriented image data and non- neutral object oriented image data prior to processing (page 5 brief). Examiner is also agree with the board that Ueda use the term "categorizing" and such term is not "parsing" (page 6, board's decision). "Categorizing" according to dictionary.com has 2 meanings and therefore, the term "categorizing" could mean any one of the 2 meanings shown in the dictionary and hence it fails to teach what is (categorizing).

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to King Y. Poon whose telephone number is (571) 272-7440.

4/10/2010

/King Y. Poon/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625

